

Remarks

Claims 1–3, 5–20 and 24–26 are pending in the application. Claims 1–3, 5–20 and 24–26 are rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

PROVISIONAL DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1–3, 5–20 and 24–26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1–14 of co-pending application 10/187,057, and claims 1–27 of co-pending application 10/208,975.

Applicant acknowledges the provisional double-patenting rejection. Should the co-pending applications issue and the issued claims warrant a nonstatutory double-patenting rejection in the instant application, Applicant will take action at that time to overcome the double patenting rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1–3, 5–20 and 24–26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Saulpaugh (U.S. 6,789,126).

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites in pertinent part (emphasis added);

receiving a request from a requester at a my-services service for location information of a user identity-based service, wherein the my-services service describes available services for a given user identity of a user of the computer network, the my-services service having a my-services schema that maintains data about other services in one or more service-related fields;

Reply to Final Office Action mailed Feb. 21, 2007

Application Number: 10/017,680

Attorney Docket Number: 190560.01

No new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least Figures 5A–5B and paragraphs [0112–0118] of the Applicant's published application.

Saulpaugh is directed to addressing message gates in a distributed computing environment. Saulpaugh discloses that services 112 and clients 110 may run in the distributed computing environment (col. 14, lines 53–55; Figures 6–8). Both clients 110 and services 112 may be URI-addressable instances of software (or firmware) that run on a device (col. 15, lines 1–5). Saulpaugh also discloses a service discovery mechanism that provides methods for clients to find services and to negotiate the rights to use some or all of a service's capabilities (col. 32, line 25, to col. 34, line 7).

Saulpaugh discloses that the service discovery mechanism describes services available to a client (i.e., an instance of software) and not available to a user identity of a user. Saulpaugh's services are associated with software on a device and not with a user, such as a person, organization, business, etc. Therefore, Saulpaugh fails to disclose “wherein the my-services service describes available services for a given user identity of user of the computer network” as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Saulpaugh fails to disclose at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Saulpaugh. Claims 2-3 and 5-20 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 102 rejections be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS 27-34

The Applicant submits that new claims 27-34 are allowable over the cited references. No new matter has been added; the Examiner's attention is directed to at least paragraphs [0118], [1425-1434] and [1448-1450] of the Applicant's published application.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: April 23, 2007

By: /A. H. Azure/

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0399
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

April 23, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Printed Name

Reply to Final Office Action mailed Feb. 21, 2007
Application Number: 10/017,680
Attorney Docket Number: 190560.01